

**REMARKS**

**INTRODUCTION:**

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 9, 11, 15, 16, and 20-27 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer, and claims 1, 2, 10, 17, and 19 have been amended. No new matter is being presented, and approval and entry are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-8, 10, 12-14, and 17-19 are pending and under consideration.

**ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER:**

In the Office Action, at page 2, the Examiner indicated that claims 2-7, and 16-18 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Applicants respectfully submit that the subject matter of claims 11, 15, and 16 has been incorporated into independent claim 10, and that claims 10, 12-14, 17, and 18 are now allowable.

**REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103:**

In the Office Action, at page 2, item 1, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 8-15, and 19-27 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over, Japanese Utility Model Publication 61-19532 (hereinafter Masaru) in view of Brown (U.S. Patent No. 5,726,602 – hereinafter Brown). The reasons for the rejection are set forth in the Office Action and therefore not repeated. Applicants traverse this rejection and respectfully request reconsideration.

Claims 9, 11, 15, and 20-27 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Applicants respectfully submit that the subject matter of claim 16 has been incorporated into independent claims 1 and 19.

Amended, independent claim 1 recites: "...wherein said amplifier comprises current amplifiers, each of which is connected to a corresponding one of the positive and negative supply voltages, the preamplified positive portion is amplified using one of the current amplifiers that is connected to the one of the positive supply voltages that is proportional to the preamplified positive portion, and the preamplified negative portion is amplified using another one of the current amplifiers that is connected to the one of the negative supply voltages that is proportional to the preamplified negative portion."

And amended, independent claim 19 recites: "...wherein each said power amplifying terminal comprises a splitting unit that splits the input signal into positive and negative signal portions, a power supply to positive and negative supply voltages of different values, an amplifier, having current amplifiers, each of which is connected to a corresponding one of the positive and negative supply voltages, the positive signal portion being amplified using one of

the current amplifiers that is connected to the one of the positive supply voltages that is proportional to the positive signal portion, and the negative signal portion is amplified using another one of the current amplifiers that is connected to the one of the negative supply voltages that is proportional to the negative signal portion...”

Masaru appears to disclose a power amplification transistor, a plurality of connection transistors, a corresponding plurality of voltage supplies, and a corresponding plurality of switches.

Brown appears to disclose an input preamplifier 14 that receives an input signal, splits the input signal into positive and negative portions, preamplifies those portions, and outputs the preamplified positive and negative portions to respective positive and negative amplifiers 34 and 38. See FIG. 1, and col. 2, line 50 to col. 3, line 22).

But Applicants respectfully submit that neither Masaru nor Brown, either alone or in combination, discloses or suggests “...wherein said amplifier comprises current amplifiers, each of which is connected to a corresponding one of the positive and negative supply voltages, the preamplified positive portion is amplified using one of the current amplifiers that is connected to the one of the positive supply voltages that is proportional to the preamplified positive portion, and the preamplified negative portion is amplified using another one of the current amplifiers that is connected to the one of the negative supply voltages that is proportional to the preamplified negative portion.”

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1 and 19 patentably distinguish over the cited art, and should be allowable for at least the above-mentioned reasons. Further, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 2-8, which ultimately depend from independent claim 1, should be allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1, as well as for the additional features recited therein.

#### CONCLUSION:

In accordance with the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that all outstanding objections and rejections have been overcome and/or rendered moot, and further, that all pending claims patentably distinguish over the cited art. Thus, there being no further outstanding objections or rejections, the application is submitted as being in condition for allowance which action is earnestly solicited.


If the Examiner has any remaining issues to be addressed, it is believed that prosecution can be expedited by the Examiner contacting the undersigned attorney for a telephone interview to discuss resolution of such issues.

If there are any underpayments or overpayments of fees associated with the filing of this Amendment, please charge and/or credit the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: April 28, 2006

By:   
Michael A. Bush  
Registration No. 48,893

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501